THEOLOGY

VOL. LIV MAY, 1951 No. 371

Editorial

THE discussion about the doctrinal implications of the Masonic ritual, which has been proceeding in the pages of THEOLOGY and which has been taken up elsewhere, seems to show that there is a *prima facie* case for an inquiry into the matter by a commission of theologians. Freemasons who have nothing to fear from such an investigation will welcome it, and non-Masons will be much relieved if an impartial inquiry shows that there is no reasonable ground for their misgivings. Moreover, some clear guidance is needed concerning the prior question whether or under what conditions a Christian is justified in joining a society that has secrets bearing on faith or morals about which he is not supposed to know anything beforehand and about which he is not at liberty to consult an impartial adviser afterwards.

It is clear from our correspondence, published and unpublished, that this is a tender spot which should now be dispassionately examined, not least in view of the fact that Freemasonry's present rate of growth is claimed to be "phenomenal". At the same time, some of our correspondents, on the one side and on the other, seem to be unduly excited and alarmed. On the one hand, the idea that many members of the Church of England are in secret consciously and deliberately believing and practising a pagan mystery religion is wide of the mark. So far as we can ascertain, few Freemasons take their ritual anything like so seriously as that. In fact, our correspondent who compares it to a "pantomime" (a comparison we should not ourselves have selected) is nearer the mark. Masons (with rare exceptions) are not much inclined to bother their heads about what the religious as distinguished from the moral elements in their ritual really mean. On the other hand, it is curious that so many of them do not know that information about their "secrets" has for long been accessible to anyone who is prepared to take the trouble to find it. Nor need they fear that non-Masons, who are in possession of such information, will want to imitate their ritual. Indeed it is apparent that Masons themselves for the most part are not attracted to the fraternity by its ritual but by its social and philanthropic aspects, which are not here in question. One may, however, place the highest possible estimate on these aspects and nevertheless have more or less grave misgivings about the doctrinal implications of the ritual, misgivings which are not altogether allayed by the explanations that have so far been put forward. We have done no more than provide a free and open platform on which a preliminary and inconclusive discussion has taken place.

The Sovereignty of God[1]

When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men.—Ephesians 4. 8.

This Sunday, falling as it does between Ascension Day and Whit-Sunday, cannot fail to call to mind the primary and, it may be, insoluble problem of the first days of Christianity. It would not be profitable, even if it were intellectually honourable, to underestimate the gravity of that problem. The superficial clarity with which the successive events of Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost appear in the traditional narrative is deceptive, and is certainly not reflected in any early Christian document, except perhaps in the Lucan writings, and even there those who think it possible to distinguish sources can discover difficulties enough. Is it possible to analyse and describe the mysterious but undeniably potent outpourings of divine power which led to the formation within Judaism, and ultimately to the separation from Judaism, of the Christian brotherhood? We are not called upon to go back into the gospels and attempt to pierce the cloud which veils the mind of our Lord himself; it is enough to note that his closest disciples, whether they had understood or misunderstood him, seem not to have expected precisely the course of events which did take place. The miscarriage of justice, the execution itself, were carried through unhindered. Elijah, forerunner of glory, did not appear. The death of Jesus took place under silent heavens, a desperate appeal to an unresponsive God. So it appeared; and the disciples, if they did not scatter at once to their homes, were disappointed and disillusioned; and not merely because Jesus had died. He had foretold his death; death in itself, therefore, even the death of the cross, could hardly have been to them so devastating a *σκάνδαλον*. Jesus had died, and his death had not, after all, proved to be the messianic affliction which should inaugurate the messianic kingdom. This was the end of another deluded hope.

Sabbath intervened, and on the first day of the week resurrection appearances began, it is hard to say where, or in what sequence. Jesus was manifesting himself not to the world, but to his own appointed witnesses. However the resurrection appearances be explained, their overwhelming effect can hardly be denied. It has left clear trace in the fragmentary, chaotic character of the resurrection narratives contained in the gospels. It was no longer possible for those who experienced it to doubt that God himself had vindicated the character and authority of his Son. Jesus was what he had claimed to be; indeed, he was more than he had, in words, claimed to be. And he was more than he had been; no longer the homeless and destitute Son of man, less fortunate than the beasts, but the heavenly Man, seated at God's right hand in majesty, with sin and death broken and bound beneath his feet. God had acted; Jesus was right, and his cause had been put in the right; death itself, the pro-

[1] A sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on 21 May 1950.

foundest reality of life, was no longer the universal monarch and arbiter of destiny. This was well; but it does not tell us how the resurrection appearances, and the conviction that Jesus was alive, were related to the narrative of the Ascension and to that decisive gift of the Holy Spirit which made the Church what it was. It does not tell us how the period of communion with the risen Jesus gave place to the settled life of the Church. We do not know, and we have no satisfactory means of learning, the answers to these questions. The Marcan narrative breaks off. We may hold what theory we choose about the original intention of the evangelist and the original shape of his gospel. For us the gospel has no word beyond the enigmatic *ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ*—enigmatic words indeed, for out of this silent fear how did the Church's message spring? This is the question we should like to answer, but St Mark will only underline it. The simplest answer is in the third gospel; but the fourth does not support it. St John does not postpone the gift of the Spirit till the feast of Pentecost; it took place already on Easter Sunday when Jesus breathed the Spirit of the new Creation into his disciples. It may even be, though of this we cannot be certain, that the same evangelist represents the Ascension as taking place on the same day. There is little information, and what information there is cannot be sorted out into a plain tale. God himself was at work, and man may not see God's face and live; still less may he detail God's movements in a notebook and reduce them to a simple press message.

We touch here the point I wished to reach. What is and must be to us a problem, the problem which confronts us whenever we try to recount the history of the first days of the Church, was to those who experienced it the deepest and most inescapable of convictions; and we shall certainly not understand even the terms of our own problem, much less the secret of the primitive Church, if we fail to recognize the conviction with which our problem is so closely bound up. It was not a simple conviction, but—and this is the point which in this sermon I wish to emphasize and apply—a twofold conviction. In course of time it was analysed into the doctrines, and ultimately into the narratives as we know them, of the Ascension of Christ and the Descent of the Spirit. Christ ascended, triumphant, leading in his train a host of captives; and being ascended he gave gifts to men, gifts of which the best (as St Luke knew) was the Holy Spirit. The extraordinary events which followed the crucifixion convinced the disciples not merely that Jesus had survived death, but of the sovereignty of God; and God's sovereignty was now to be expressed in two ways, in the sovereignty of the Son of God who ruled in heaven, and in the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit who ruled on earth.

It is this twofold sovereignty which the problem of the post-crucifixion events forces upon our notice. It is the same twofold sovereignty which the writer of the Epistle to the Ephesians forces upon us also, not least by doing violence to the text of the Psalm he quotes. "He received gifts", says the Psalm; "he gave gifts", says our author. It is interesting to guess that he was using an interpretation of the Psalm later written down in a targum. "Thou hast ascended

to heaven, that is Moses the prophet. Thou hast led captivity captive, thou hast learned the words of Torah, thou hast given them to the sons of men as gifts, and even with the disobedient, when they turn in repentance, there abides the dwelling of the glory of the Lord God." Perhaps the epistle teaches us that Christ the new Moses ascended into heaven to give men as gifts not the letter of the law, but the Spirit by which the law was now written on their hearts. Perhaps it was so; but it seems more probable that it was simply the force of Christian conviction which broke and remoulded the Biblical words. Christ resplendent in glory, "full for all of truth and grace", could do nothing but give. Of his fullness have we all received. Nothing could indicate more significantly than this misquotation (when taken in its context in Ephesians) that double sovereignty of Christ in heaven and of the Spirit on earth, which is the dogmatic content and the religious conviction of those calendar events we call Ascension and Pentecost.

I must emphasize the importance of this conclusion. It is not reached by spiritualizing or dogmatizing certain plain narratives, which ordinary men, unhampered by training in the tortuous processes of theological thought, would never suspect of ulterior meaning. The problem lies in the narratives, which are not simple but obscure. Both the religion and the dogma are earlier than the narratives, and more primitive. This is an observation of immense significance. There are many to-day to whom it seems clear that the earliest form in which Christian preaching and doctrine were cast was eschatological; it involved both propositions and thought-forms which, whether we view them with nostalgia or distaste, the Church cannot use after nineteen centuries of Christian history. Is it possible to be faithful to the primitive gospel and yet to avoid statements which the mere lapse of time has invalidated? This is one of the most momentous questions Biblical theology is facing; and it becomes easier to answer when such a fact as we have been examining is borne in mind. One element which lies behind the problems of early Christian history and thought is this conviction regarding the two ways in which God reigns; two ways sufficiently distinct, but which must never be separated.

I propose now to consider briefly the bearing of this twofold sovereignty of God upon several points of Christian theology and Christian life.

1. *The Doctrine of God.* "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off?" It is perhaps not an exaggeration to say that the pendulum of Christian thought has always swung between the extremes of a God afar off and a God at hand.

On the one hand, it is possible to trace from times sufficiently early the insistence that "God is in heaven, and thou art on earth". The "infinite qualitative distinction" between time and eternity, God and man, is much older than Kierkegaard, though the language may be his own. God is the high and holy one, who inhabits eternity; man is neither high nor holy, and he is nothing if not mortal. The candle is soon out and the player off the stage. God is all that

men are not; he is *Rex tremendae majestatis,* while humanity is a *massa perditionis.* God is the *mysterium,* fascinating but unknowable, and incapable, even when experienced, of being expressed in rational terms. God is "wholly other" than man, he is "hidden even when revealed". All this is language which, exaggerated and unnecessarily paradoxical as it may in part appear, has respectable Christian ancestry.

On the other hand, there is another succession of mystics and pietists for whom the distant God has little attraction. For them, nothing is more immediate, nothing more intimate, than the soul's converse with God. The dwelling-place of God is not light unapproachable. He is the light of reason and of love which burns in a man's own heart; he exists within; humanity itself is divine, and the gulf between God and man, so far from being unbridgeable, becomes almost unthinkable. "The outward God he findeth not who finds not God within."

Every theologian is of course familiar with these strains of thought; and he is, perhaps, theologian but no man if he does not at times feel himself drawn into one camp rather than the other. Most, however, would probably find themselves compelled to agree that neither extreme can satisfy completely the demands of the mind and the conscience, to say nothing of the Bible. But the way of advance is not to choose a suitable middle point and hope that there the pendulum may settle in tranquil equilibrium, though most theologians will be familiar with this temptation also. Neither of the extremes I have mentioned can be treated so. Neither is wrong in what it affirms. Christian thinkers, however they may be given to compromise, cannot say, We will have less of the majestic remoteness of God than Calvin, and, again, less of his immanence than Fox. God is not less majestic and remote than theologians have made him; he is infinitely more so, glorious far beyond the limits of the most exalted human language. God is not less near and intimate than mystics have made him; he is infinitely nearer, nearer than life itself. No doctrine of God which cannot find room for both these poles of thought is worth considering; and, what is more important and the point I wish here to apply, no doctrine of God which cannot find room for both does justice to the primary conviction of primitive Christianity.

The ascended Christ is all that man is not. Man is subject to the power of death: Christ having died once dies no more; death no more has dominion over him. Man is unable to escape from the cycle of sin and its retribution in more sin: it was to sin Christ died, and his resurrection was the vindication of the divine righteousness which had marked his life. Man suffers pain of body and mind; in his greatest moments he is subject to failure—failure in knowledge, achievement, and power: Christ is seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high, sharing with his Father the glory he enjoyed before the world was. Christ is all that we are not; yet he is also all that we are. He reigns in heaven in his ascended and glorified manhood, crowned with glory and honour in the pledge and prophecy that all

things will yet be set under the feet of man. Further, as Christ is Lord in heaven the Spirit is Lord on earth. God is in heaven, and man upon earth, the Old Testament had declared; it was now tolerable and indeed necessary to assert, Man is in heaven and God upon earth. The divine nature of Christ transfigured his humanity; the divinity of the Holy Spirit was and is, in union with our humanity, transforming it into the image of Christ himself. God is infinitely different from man; yet God and man are united in the closest intimacy, and that both in heaven and on earth. This is not (it must be emphasized) the dogmatic superstructure of Christianity; it is the shape of the primitive faith itself as it arose in history and clothed itself in narrative.

2. *The Doctrine of the Church.* It is in the New Testament abundantly clear that the Church is not an assembly of religious persons, drawn together by respect for each other's opinions and with the intention of cultivating their souls by the most attractive and congenial methods. The Church rather is a body of persons set under authority; the authority is not accidental; without it there would be no Church. Men had not even freely chosen to become members of the body. They had been called and grafted into it by a power other than their own. You have not chosen me, their Master said, but I have chosen you. They were slaves of Christ, set under the sovereign authority of God himself. It is true that their service was perfect freedom, but that was a result which flowed from the nature of the authority under which they were placed. This authority was, of course, the dual authority of Ascension and Pentecost; the authority of the Lord in heaven and the authority of the Lord on earth. The Church's πολίτευμα was in heaven, but it was not governed by an absentee potentate; the divine life circulated in every part, the authority was immediate and personal. It was manifested in the community by the words of prophets, and was written on the hearts of the faithful.

The Church, in the first days, knew itself to be an eschatological community, the remnant of God's people elected to do him service, and to bear witness to him in the time of testing before the consummation. Precisely because it was such a community, living with such a purpose and in such an interval, it was subject to the twofold authority of Christ and the Spirit. The interval has since become so far extended that it is difficult to think of it as an interval at all; but the Church remains the same Church, and its purpose is unaltered, in so far as it lives still under the same authority. This is perhaps the most fundamental of all the essential marks of the Church of Christ, which must always acknowledge its dependence both upon the incarnate Lord whose acts and teaching first constituted it, and upon the Lord the Spirit who through all ages lives and works in its charity, its doctrine and its worship. It is important that the outward form of the Church should bear clear witness to this peculiar authority. I have no right to tread upon the controversial ground which opens before me here, and I have no intention of doing so; I would rather say that every reputable form of Church

government seems to me to hold out the possibility, if it is rightly exercised, of revealing and applying the authority upon which the Church historically rests. It is, however, proper to point out that if the Church does neglect one of these aspects of its life it does so at its peril.

The Church must never forget that it is subject to the absolute authority of Jesus Christ, who lived and died among men and is now—the same Lord—exalted in heaven. All that was manifest, humanly, brokenly, in the incarnate Person is now enthroned at the right hand of God. Teaching intended—if so it was—for a brief interim period before the Parousia has been exalted with its author to become the eternal rule of life. The ready compassion, the humble acceptance of obscurity and suffering, the inflexible obedience to the will of the Father—these are exalted with the Person who manifested them to be the eternal rule of life. The divine mission of succour to humanity, the divine judgment of sin and of self-righteousness, these are the foundations upon which the Church rests. The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner. These things—the divine act of redemption, the divine pattern of life—are the government and law of the Church. It would be possible, but it would be tedious and depressing, to recall occasions when the Church, self-confident and impatient of history, has exalted its present opinions and its current experience at the expense of its historic Lord. The Church can never be a self-contained organism; it never fails so badly as when it is most at home in the world. "Zion in her anguish with Babylon must cope", and the Church must keep its eye fixed ever upon the Lord in heaven; which task it will perform if it keeps its eye fixed upon the Lord in history, and therefore upon the Lord in Scripture.

This does not, however, mean that the Church is abandoned either to historical research or to apocalyptic yearning. We have not been left desolate. The Church lives in the presence and under the direction of the eternal Spirit, who is no less truly the Lord. That is, there is immediacy and authority in the Church's teaching and knowledge. To say this is not to diminish the Church's subjection to the historic Christ, or its dependence upon Christ; it is rather to point to the means by which this subjection and this dependence are put into effect. The Church is a living body, animated and controlled by the Spirit of God. So long therefore as the Church is faithful and obedient—and no longer—it wields a living magisterium. Here is the form into which the paradox of the Church now falls; this, perhaps, is the twentieth-century translation of what in the first century would have been expressed by saying that the Church is both of this age and of the age to come.

3. *Worship.* Worship, perhaps more clearly than anything else, is the mirror of eschatology, and the means by which eschatological forces may be transmitted to an age beyond the range of the original eschatological tension. Further, there is no part of the Church's life where the outward and inward authority represented by the dual event by which it was constituted come more clearly to sight. This

will appear at once if the basic forms of Christian worship are briefly considered.

In the preaching of the Word of God the Church manifestly submits itself to the ultimate authority of the historic manifestation of the Word made flesh, incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth. There is no need to labour the fact that preaching is utterly and radically misconceived if it be regarded as the utterance of opinion, however learned and pious the opinion may be. In the service of the Word of God the Church gathers under the Bible that it may be recalled to that unique act of God in which it had its origin: the submission of Jesus to death and his exaltation by the power of God. Yet, though preaching is thus as objective as any act the Church can perform, it is not exclusively objective in the sense in which a lecture on oriental religions or Church history may be objective. It is a mode of address which makes immediate contact with the hearer, and does so because it not merely carries with it an appeal to external authority, but is at the same time the means by which the internal authority, that of the Spirit, becomes active in the mind and conscience of the listener. Preaching is a manifestation of the authority of the ascended Christ by the agency of the Lord the Spirit who takes away the veil from those who look upon the written word.

Similar remarks may be made about the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, rites which, it is being more and more clearly recognized, are eschatological in their origin, and once were looked on as the means by which the age to come invaded the present. Baptism is baptism into Christ, into his death and resurrection. In it the convert is united with the whole process of shame and glory through which Christ passed. It has always been accompanied by a profession of faith, in New Testament times no doubt the simple but sufficient confession, "Jesus is Lord"; and baptism indeed means nothing if it is not an act of submission to the Lord Jesus. But equally, baptism is a sacrament of the Holy Spirit. It is not only submission to a Lord in heaven and a historical event in which God acted; it is a direct experience of the divine power which acted then and acts still.

The eucharist moves about the same two poles of thought. On the one hand, it is an *ἀνάμνησις*. In it there are recalled real acts of a real person, performed at a particular time—the night in which he was betrayed. Jesus is recalled, but recalled as the exalted Lord, for whose coming the Church waits, obedient to his commands "until he come". In a real sense the eucharist recalls a divine absence, reminding us that Christ lived at a time when we did not, and reigns in heaven while we struggle on earth; both facts which it is well we should remember. But they are not the whole truth, for even more forcibly the eucharist signifies to us the presence of a divine Lord, present, as ancient liturgies and (not least) Charles Wesley's sacramental hymns remind us, by the working of the Holy Spirit.

> Come, Holy Ghost, thine influence shed,
> And realize the sign;
> Thy life infuse into the bread,
> Thy power into the wine.

Here also, then, we find the dual sovereignty of a Lord in heaven and a Lord near at hand.

4. All the points we have hitherto considered converge upon the last, which may therefore be treated with the greatest brevity. The doctrine of God, the doctrine of the Church; the great Church acts, preaching and the sacraments, all these point forward to the Christian experience of God itself, the simplest and most mysterious thing of all. It would be possible to raise here perennial problems of theology and philosophy—nature and grace, choice and predestination, the will free and the will in bondage. It may be that the practical way through these difficulties, the way which will commend itself to the humble believer if not to the expert philosopher, will be found by recalling what we have already seen to be the structure of the Church's life from the day of its foundation. There is a Lord in heaven, whose authority is absolute, whose will cannot be resisted, whose grace is invincible, from whose judgment there is no appeal. Upon his mercy we are utterly dependent. Yet this Lord, when he ascended up on high and led captivity captive, gave gifts to men, and his best gift was the gift of himself, revealed in another mode of being and operation, the Holy Spirit. It is by his work that our wills become God's, that his choice becomes ours, and that the life of free obedience becomes possible.

Christ, who now gone up on high
Captive leads captivity;
While his foes from him receive
Grace that God with man may live . . .

Never will he thence depart,
Inmate of a humble heart;
Carrying on his work within,
Striving till he casts out sin . . .

Come, divine and peaceful Guest,
Enter our devoted breast;
Life divine in us renew,
Thou the Gift, and Giver too!

C. K. Barrett.

The Pastoral and Evangelistic Opportunities of Funerals

Following the example of its Lord, the Church should always look for pastoral and evangelistic opportunities in situations which already exist. Our Lord did not first try to make special conditions in which to do his work—as is the way in certain types of evangelistic mission to-day. He called and converted people in the places where he found them—Levi at the receipt of custom, fishermen mending their nets, and in the miracles of healing generally. And we are told that the Holy Spirit came to the Church at Pentecost in the place where they naturally and properly happened to be. There was no advance publicity, no special times of preparation or summoning up of a spirit of expectancy. The Holy Spirit came, and worked through a given situation.

In our work to-day, we must not try to be wiser or more subtle than our Master. We must learn to exploit to the full those circumstances in which we actually are, and not be forever trying to create conditions of meeting, as is so often suggested to us by the appointed experts in evangelism. And, in fact, there is a very wide range of situations where the Church is in contact with people. Whatever may be said about the decline in the practice of the Christian religion (and there is far too much alarmist talk about it) most people still turn to the Church at the great climacterics of life—birth, marriage, and death. It can be argued that there is a great deal of social convention in this, the mere persistence of the form of religion, and even superstition. But for all that we are placed in certain "given" situations, where the Gospel can properly be presented. Any rigorist approach to the occasional offices of the Prayer Book, which has the effect of destroying these occasions of meeting, should be resisted. All this is becoming increasingly recognized, and acted upon, in relation to baptism and marriage. Efforts, which are not always unsuccessful, are being made to use baptisms and marriages as opportunities to deepen the faith of some, and to awaken others to the truths of the Christian religion.

But there is very little sign that the pastoral and evangelistic opportunities of funerals are receiving anything like the same attention. And yet almost everybody who dies is buried with the benefit of some religious service. This means that large numbers of people have a definite contact with the Church's ministry. And what is perhaps even more important for our immediate purposes, the bereaved and the mourners take for granted in an entirely natural way that this will be so. When, as is frequently the case, the clergy have taken care over sick-visiting before the death, the family are favourably disposed to the parson—always an advantage. They are grateful to one who has been kind to someone they love, and whose death has left a blank in the family circle. When care is taken over the funeral service, and the arrangements are reverently and tactfully made, then this favourable predisposition is increased.

But observe what happens. The friendly sentiments continue at least for a time, until the emotional shock has worn off. And one would suppose that here was soil in which the seed sown would produce an ample crop. In fact, in very few cases does the experience of death in a family serve either to deepen faith where it already exists or to awaken it where there has been indifference or hostility. There seems to be a barrier, which prevents death from being integrated into faith and the practice of religion. Every parson knows this: but we are most of us in the dark as regards what to do about it.

Any inquiry into this must obviously begin by considering the strange fact that whereas the New Testament has a very clear notion of what is meant by death, and of its essential connexion with the Christian dispensation, yet the majority of churchgoers do not take up their thoughts and emotions about death into their theology. If the New Testament ideas of death and resurrection in Christ were taken away, the whole theology would be so lopsided that it would

collapse entirely. We are baptized into the death of Christ, and are now raised to new life in him. At death we "sleep in Jesus" until the Resurrection, when all come to fullness of life in him. There is nothing here of individualism, nothing of individual survival in a spiritual sense. Rather is there a profound conviction that death and resurrection, like our life in Christ in his Church now, are matters of corporate concern. And this is in complete contrast to the ideas of death and the future life which are generally accepted even among those who regularly go to Church. We must, then, look at some of these ideas.

First of all, there is a great reluctance to face the fact of death at all—e.g. it is extraordinarily hard to get adult Confirmation candidates to see what is meant by the Creed's statement that our Lord was "dead and buried". Such phrases as "called to higher service", "passed on", and "gone before", indicate an unwillingness to face facts. This is encouraged by the practice of reading the alternative lessons from Revelation in the 1928 Prayer Book Burial Office. Together with this there goes the notion that the body is of no further significance at death, and that what is called the spirit or the soul alone persists and has value. Life after death is thought of as an individual thing, a "spiritual" thing, automatic and immediate. Because we do not like to have any but the most charitable thoughts about our departed friends and relations, we tend to think that this spiritual survival is an entry into a state of bliss, independently of the life lived before death. "Grandpa is not really dead; that is only his body; the real Grandpa is with the angels." This kind of unscriptural speaking characterizes what many think and feel about death, and drives away the grand and austere New Testament teaching.

The Romish doctrine of purgatory, "a fond thing vainly invented" and based upon no certain warrant of Holy Scripture, has penetrated into our thinking far more than we like to recognize. Very many people are powerfully affected in their ideas about death by a perverted and over-simplified notion of a doctrine, which has a surprisingly strong hold in certain sections of the Church. It is a matter for regret that no authoritative voice was raised against the blasphemous implications of the Roman Holy Year, which has just ended. It is monstrously unscriptural and wicked to suggest that any merits we may be alleged to have won in this life can affect the destiny of those who have been baptized, and now sleep in Jesus. For there are those who believe that after death, or passing on, we simply carry on progressing in a spiritual sphere where we have greater advantages than we now possess, and so make rather more rapid progress. This is not a caricature; very many people do think like this, and it can be traced to the infiltration of sub-Christian, Roman ideas.

It is much easier to say that something is wrong than it is to know what to do to put it right. We all find diagnosis easier than providing a cure. But it is as well to recognize when things are wrong: and no one can be satisfied with the present position about funerals and

the general attitude to death among large sections even of the church-going population. There is no panacea which can be applied in this situation. If we want to make use of the pastoral and evangelistic opportunities which are latent in funerals, we must first recover the New Testament teaching about death and resurrection in Christ. It is painfully difficult to banish erroneous doctrines, particularly when we have had a share in establishing them. And Gresham's Law applies in matters of religion, too. But with charity and tact the effort must be made to proclaim the New Testament doctrine—and that not only in sermons, but perhaps even more importantly in the pastoral contacts we make, and in the whole life of the Church. For example, notices of departed members of the congregation in the parish magazine often contradict the teaching which has been given from the pulpit.

Here are a few suggestions which are offered for consideration, in the belief that they would help to restore a more Christian attitude to death and funerals.

1. There should be a general return to the 1662 Burial Office, which avoids many of the sentimentalities of the 1928 service, and contains none of the false individualism to be found in so many "made-up" funeral services. In particular, the three sentences provided at the beginning should not be added to by any of the 1928 alternatives, which divert attention from the matter in hand, which is the burial of a Christian, to the emotions of the mourners. These three sentences are a colloquy between the Lord, the person being buried, and the Church, and are a noble expression of Christian faith and hope. It seems a pity to disturb this by the intrusion of other scriptural texts which, though true and valuable, are not at that point relevant. And never, never should the 1928 alternative lessons from Revelation be read, for they tend to support very questionable ideas about those who have just died. It is much better to stick to the lesson from 1 Corinthians, which gives a fine expression to the New Testament faith. And when this is read carefully, and the people have an opportunity of following the text, it makes a funeral oration otiose. Where hymns are sung, the very greatest discretion should be used in their choice. And the parson must be prepared to refuse hymns which do not support the Christian faith on this point—many favourite hymns are sung "by request" at funerals, and they do stimulate false ideas about death.

2. The growing practice of holding "Requiem" celebrations of the Holy Communion should be curbed, unless it is quite clearly established that this is no more than a memorial of those who have departed this life. Such memorials could perhaps be best made at the Sunday Eucharist. Here we see a further example of the infiltration of an erroneous Roman doctrine, which is contrary to the Biblical teaching.

3. It is particularly important that the conduct of funerals at cemetery chapels should be watched. The chapels are all too often disgraceful in appearance and furnishing. It is most desirable to do all we can to have the first part of a funeral service in a parish

church, partly because of the unsatisfactory nature of these cemetery chapels, but also because we must try and integrate every death into the life of the Church. Many parsons find it extremely difficult to take a funeral at the cemetery on any but the most superficial plane —the mourners are unknown and almost certainly there will be no further contact with them. Every effort should be made to avoid this, and the undertakers should be asked to refer the family personally to the parson as much in advance of the funeral as possible. Experience shows that most undertakers are only too pleased to have this opportunity of co-operating with the clergy. For unless we do try to have this personal contact—involving at least one interview with the chief mourners—it is difficult to see how our ministry can be effectively exercised. The complaints of casualness and perfunctoriness which are made against officiating clergymen at cemetery funerals are perhaps not entirely fair, but they do have some foundation and steps should be taken to remove the occasion of them.

It is most unlikely that these observations will have anything like general approval, but if they serve to awaken concern for the better handling of this matter, they will have achieved their purpose. Nobody can be satisfied with the present position in regard to funerals; and in the conviction that many pastoral and evangelistic opportunities are going by default, this paper is offered for consideration and criticism.

ERIC WILD.

Great Preachers—V. St Bernard

THE function of preaching has been defined as the setting forth of Christ the living Word from the written Word by means of the spoken word. Such a definition, if accepted, affords a useful basis on which to discuss, and a working formula by which to measure, the effectiveness and greatness of St Bernard as a preacher.

In fairness to the reader, however, it is only right to mention that, for pressing reasons, no more than the eighty-six sermons on the Song of Songs, and a smaller number on the Seasons, have been studied for the purpose of the present article. But as it was the opinion of Mabillon that the former sum up all that the saint has to say about Christian spirituality, we may safely base our conclusions on such a limited survey without fear of their needing serious modification in the light of further reading.

The above definition proves itself peculiarly apt when applied to the case of St Bernard, whose method it describes, and to whose greatness it provides the clue. For his preaching had one purpose only, to set forth to his beloved monks the knowledge and vision of Christ, the living Word and Wisdom of God; Christ the Bridegroom of the soul, its hope, its joy, and its light.

Thus we come at once upon the first secret of his power, his single, never-dying love of this Jesus whom he preached. "Give me a man", he says (Song of Songs, 50), voicing his own aspiration, "who before all things loves God with all his being, who loves both him-

self and his neighbour in the same degree in which he loves God." And inseparable from love, the spring of his soul, was his own experimental knowledge of union with Christ's divinity in contemplation, that union which, directly or indirectly, is the subject of all his sermons. These together, as nothing else could have done, must have raised men's minds above the pettiness of conventual quarrelling, and the misery of physical discomfort in Clairvaux, to a sense of the naked reality of God, and to the love of Christ. To lead his monks to such love and knowledge in contemplation was indeed his own conception of the end of preaching. "My purpose", he says (S. of S. 16), "is not so much to comment on words as to move and enkindle hearts." But the success to which history testifies must have owed much to his characteristically vivid manner of describing this experience—experience he is by no means ashamed of admitting. "The Word," he says, "though I say in my foolishness, has visited me, and even very often" (S. of S. 74); and in these visits "an inpoured savour of the heavenly sweetness" is tasted by the soul. "In the union of the soul with God the Word utters no sound but penetrates; it is not full of words but of power; it strikes not on the ear but caresses the heart; the form of its face is not defined, and it does not touch the eyes of the body: but it makes glad the heart, not with the charm of colour, but with the love it bestows" (ibid.). "There follows a sudden and unusual extension of the mind, an infusion of light which illuminates the intellect either to the knowledge of the Scriptures or to the comprehension of mysteries" (S. of S. 57). Preaching of this sort is almost sacramental.

The naked sincerity of his mind, the knowledge his hearers possessed that his life was a mirror of his words, and his words a mere echo of his life—these things gave his words their note of authority. Heroic asceticism was the gold behind his speech which made its ring true; for it was Bernard's own opinion that the preacher should practise what he taught. We preach not ourselves, it is true; yet when we know that a man's preaching corresponds with his life, the impact of the sense of reality which his words convey is almost irresistible. St Bernard spoke with power because he preached to an age which judged a man's spirituality by his freedom from the comforts of common men, and Bernard had none.

Yet the saint was no mere ascetic: he was not held in awe only, nor would he have cared to have been so: he was loved as perhaps few abbots have been loved: and he was loved above all for the grace of humility which adorned his life, that humility which he calls "the heart of the soul" (S. of S. 45). It was humility which enabled him to decrease so far that Christ's wisdom and charity flowed through him to his sons in religion without impediment of personal vanity. The country parson's hope "to make humility lovely in men's eyes" would have won the whole assent of his mind, for he knew well enough that no other way lay open to their hearts. Without such meekness the directness of his manner in rebuke would surely have betrayed him into scolding and his just complaining into whining.

But this very firmness in rebuking introduces us to that consist-

ently attractive characteristic of his preaching, the captivating love he bore his monks. He knew them all: some of them must have squirmed beneath the unmistakably pointed allusions to their vagaries and vanities. Yet he loved them, too: not in general, but each in particular. To the less spiritual such discriminating affection must have been a persecution; to the holiest it must have been a revelation of divinity. For all of them it gave his words a relevance and urgency which could not be ignored.

Bernard did not gloat over his souls, however. He never delights in the intimate knowledge of them which he had as their confessor. Indeed, he says startling things of his sense of their remoteness from him, and their inaccessibility. "Each of them", he complains (Ser. III Advnt. in John 1. 10), "is an unfathomable abyss, a dark mystery to me. I have no certain knowledge either of my own conscience or of my neighbour's." And this sense of the otherness, the dignity, and mystery of the souls in his care is the source of his respect for them, that profound respect for their inner integrity and freedom which resembles our Lord's affectionate reverence for the souls of children. "He that will be respected must respect", says George Herbert. Many in Clairvaux loved their abbot: some envied him, and some bore him malice, but all respected him; and their respect, answering his, gave his word free course in them.

Our original formula now requires us to consider St Bernard's use of the written word of Scripture from which he preached the living Word of God.

It is platitudinous though not superfluous to say that he knew it perfectly. Some of his sermons are little more than a procession of Biblical phrases, connected by the links of his own reasoning. Indeed, in certain instances they are possibly overloaded, for it is remarkable that the three sermons on Luke 1. 28–33, from which Biblical quotations are noticeable by their absence, are among the most moving. Not a word of his text is passed over without consideration, for he felt that "not the smallest particle of the sacred and precious text of Scripture was without meaning". No iota is omitted: every fragment is gathered.

More impressive than knowledge of the text, however, is the sense of its unity and self-consistency which his sermons reveal. All Scripture spoke to him of Christ. "All the prophets", he says, "are of one spirit: they saw and predicted the same great fact, by the same Spirit. Moses saw Christ in the bush, Aaron in his rod, Gideon in the dew upon his fleece of wool, Solomon in the virtuous woman" (*Missus est*, Ser. IX, in Luke 1. 26). Armchair typology, we may say; and we should be wrong. For to St Bernard Christ was a variant spelling of charity, which he declares (S. of S. 51) to be the rule of expounding all Scripture, and the end which all interpretation must serve. Hence the whole weight of the sacred text is directed to the single end of awakening souls and stretching their capacity for charity. Scripture may have other uses as excellent and necessary, but none more so, nor any more effective.

Related to this biblicism is his use of reason and argument. St

Bernard has been called the enemy of reason, a grave charge beyond the scope of the present article to dispute; but three observations may be in place, since they affect our estimate of his preaching. First, so far from his being an enemy of reason, it is noticeable that his reasoning is at times of such force that his allegorizing breaks down beneath the strain of it. His triumphant vindication of reason at the bar of Scripture sometimes leaves us wondering whether he would not have been wiser to have paid more attention to its valid surface meaning.

Secondly, he hotly denies any intention of censuring the learned or condemning the study of literature (S. of S. 36). "All knowledge is good in itself, if it be founded on truth", which he calls "a priceless jewel" (41); but as he observes, St Paul "does not commend the knowing of many things in one who is ignorant of the right manner of knowing" (36).

Thirdly, of the first importance for preaching in the present age, he approaches the emotions, not directly, but by a prior appeal to the mind, "kindling the fire through musing" with his hearers. "Let the soul grind [the psalm] with the teeth of her intelligence" (S. of S. 7); for "the intellect", he says (41), "discharges for the soul functions analogous to those which the neck performs for the body, since it is through the intellect that all spiritual food passes into the soul, and is conveyed to the digestive organs of the will and the affections." Exhortation without teaching is dangerous, ultimately ineffective, and spiritually illegitimate.

The third division of our formula is concerned with St Bernard's use of the spoken word, of which he was a master. His eloquence exemplifies his statement that "the affections have their own language", "by the fire of love transcending all human reason", as à Kempis says. But he was exact, too, treading with ease through the subtlest questions of strict divinity. The charm of his voice and presence, which, like Newman's, his sermons need, makes him the Christian Dorian Gray. Forthright, he rebukes snoring; realistic, he stops when his monks are weary; shrewd, he tells them their vanities; wise, he warns them it were better not to be virgins than to grow haughty about virginity. Not unobservant, as some maintain, he notices all that may help his work of preaching, Nature included: his description of a drowning man's antics might have come from the latest life-saving manual. Like Jeremy Taylor's Virtue, he "never laughs, but is always delightful".

St Bernard may have had his weaknesses. He may have been more "a technician of individual salvation", as the Pope has recently been described, than concerned with social redemption. Yet he views individuals primarily as members of the Church, and in his measure he did redeem society: first in Clairvaux by the charity he spread, and prized so far above all else; and more widely by the schisms he healed with the ointment of the same heroic charity. His preaching was heard and revered throughout Europe: greatness could surely have gone no further.

To love God, therefore, as he did; to know him experimentally in

contemplation and by meditation in Scripture; to love one's people and know their lives; to be oneself conformed to the splendour one has seen in contemplation by humility and self-denial in the restrained exuberance of Christian joy—to do and be these things will infallibly suggest the secret ways by which in every age the seeds of the Gospel, of love, and of contemplation may be sown, and fire cast again on the earth.[1]

J. K. Byrom.

The Meaning of ὑπόστασις

One of the most difficult words in Greek adequately to translate seems to be *ὑπόστασις*. There are said to be nineteen instances in LXX, and examples of its use must be sought for in Hatch and Redpath's great Concordance. I have noted some ten different meanings in the course of my reading, and doubtless the list is not complete. The lexicon of Liddell and Scott will supply a good deal of information about its use in classical authors: I confine myself almost wholly to non-classical.

(1) *Substance*, or *real nature*)(*εἶδος*: cf. *ep. ad Diogn.* ii.

(2) *Ground of support; firm foundation:* as in LXX *ὑπ. ζωῆς*=staff of life; and in *Test. xii Patr. ἐν βρώμασίν ἐστι ὑπ. τῆς ἰσχύος.*

(3) *Person:* post-Nicene use, as in Cyril of Alex. *ad Nestr.* iii. 8.

(4) *Essence*, as in Heb. 1. 3 (as Wordsworth contends).

(5) *Firmness;* firm confidence (cf. Heb. 3. 14). In Heb. 11. 1 the meaning is best expressed by "assurance". Similarly in Psalms 39. 8 Wetstein remarks that this sense is found in Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, and Josephus.

(6) *Resolution* (under pain).

(7) *Hope*—possibly this is the meaning in Ps. Sol. 15. 7.

(8) *Character:* cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii § 77 *ἀδελφοί, κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἔργων ὑπόστασιν.*

(9) *Existence.* Thus in Athanasius, *ἡ ὑπ. ἐστιν οὐσία.*

(10) *Nature:* Lat "substantia"; cf. Ambrose in the hymn beginning "Intende, qui regis Israel", and elsewhere where the Greek *οὐσία* is being rendered: was not Tertullian responsible for this rendering? See Mayor's note on Tert. *Apol.* and reff. there (p. 290), together with Canon Evan's discussion of *ὑπόστασις* in his Ed. of Tert. *Prax.*, p. 39 ff.

(11) It has been suggested (e.g. by the late Prof. Souter) that the word may signify "title-deed" in Heb. 11. 1.

E. H. Blakeney.

---

[1] The Latin texts of St Bernard's Sermons may be found in Migne, *Patrologia latina*, vol. 183.

There is a collection of St Bernard's Letters, his Sermons on the Song of Songs, and seventeen Sermons on the Seasons, edited by Mabillon, and translated by S. J. Eales, published by Elliot Stock, London, 1889–95.

There is also a translation of the Sermons on the Song of Songs by a Priest of Mount Melleray, published in two volumes by Browne and Nolan, Dublin, 1920.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. C. K. Barrett is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham and the author of *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition.*

The Rev. Eric Wild is Vicar of St George's Church, Wigan.

The Rev. J. K. Byrom is Vicar of Cheadle Hulme.

Mr Blakeney was formerly Headmaster of the King's School, Ely.

CORRESPONDENCE

SHOULD A CHRISTIAN BE A FREEMASON?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The task of replying to the critics of my article is not made easier by the fact that these critics disagree. Mr MacGregor Lewis admits frankly that Freemasonry is based on legend and myth full of errors and false doctrine, steeped in Pelagian Englishry. Mr Dart is apparently prepared to admit nothing of the kind. Both write as champions of the Craft. My task, therefore, appears to be to show the former to be right at the expense of the latter.

One point on which these critics agree is in denouncing me for using perjured evidence. This shows a typical Masonic naivety, for information is readily available. Anyone could have written my article after a week's research in the British Museum library. My footnote relating to the filling in of gaps was perhaps expressed misleadingly; it referred, not to a personal disclosure, but to a final check on my facts from a certain recent manuscript not yet published but compiled from within the Craft. Deliberate deception is completely ruled out. I am surprised at Mr MacGregor Lewis for even suggesting it, unless the possibility is entertained that every Masonic ritual published by A. Lewis and Co. is a deliberate hoax, and that every gentleman seen on trains and in restaurants committing them to memory is wasting his time.

The question then arises, is one an accessory to perjury in reading and disclosing the contents of books which from the Masonic point of view ought never to have been written? Or does this accusation spring mainly from the assumption, not often challenged, that Freemasonry, alone among religious organizations, should enjoy a position of privileged immunity from investigation and criticism?

Some of our greatest classical scholars must come under this condemnation of using perjured evidence. For, to take but one example, the mysteries of Eleusis were secret. Admittedly they are dead and Freemasonry is not. But suppose, for the sake of argument, it should be discovered that in some remote fastness of the Aegeans these secret rites were still being kept alive to-day. Would that make the researches of the scholar "scandalous"?

There is one further point that may grievously offend Freemasons, yet which cannot be overlooked. The Masonic obligations are taken on the strict understanding that they can in no way conflict with the

candidate's religious duties. In the possible event of his discovery that they do so conflict, then the oath is taken on false pretences, as "A Parish Priest" points out, and is therefore null.

In this matter of the oaths Mr Dart has either forgotten his ritual or hopes that I have. Of course no one is compelled to take these vows, but, on the other hand, no one knows what it is that he is to take—the candidate pledges himself in advance to secrecy and obedience, under previously undisclosed penalties. "The Freemason", writes Mr Dart, "does not say 'I swear by God' or 'I take God to witness' or 'as I hope for salvation'." But the meaning, and even the wording, of the Obligation is almost exactly that. "I, A. B., in the presence of the Great Architect of the Universe—do hereby and hereon (touching the Bible with his right hand) sincerely and solemnly promise and swear . . . so help me God." Swearing specifically in the presence and by the help of God is surely very similar to taking God to witness. As for the hope of salvation, has Mr Dart ever seriously considered the meaning of this part of the penalty: "buried in the sand of the sea at low water mark, or a cabletow's length from the shore where the tide regularly ebbs and flows twice in the course of twenty-four hours"? This means, as Masonic scholars point out, burial not only in unconsecrated ground, but in ground that never can be consecrated, symbolizing loss of salvation.

"There is no wickedness", affirms Mr Dart, "in saying to a friend, if I do so-and-so you can knock me down. It will serve me right." But surely the difference between saying this to a friend and swearing on the Bible that you will accept a penalty of having your throat cut across, or your bowels burned to ashes, is exactly the difference between simple punishment and murder by torture and mutilation, between a flippant remark and an impious oath. Yet the Worshipful Master says to the candidate after he has taken it: "To render it a solemn obligation you will seal it with your lips on the Volume of the Sacred Law." Is it then "nonsense" for a Christian to feel that such obligations violate his principles, and Article XXXIX?

What priest would not be struck with horror and disgust if at some future revision of the Prayer Book his ordination vows were to be rewritten as follows: "Will you reverently obey your ordinary and other chief ministers—submitting yourselves to their godly judgments, under no less a penalty than that of having your left breasts laid open, your hearts torn therefrom, and given to the ravening birds of the air, or devouring beasts of the forests and plain?" Would that horror and disgust be alleviated even if the bishop reassured him that the penalty was purely symbolic? Yet if Christian and clerical Masons consider it right for a Fellow-Craftsman to be asked to swear in these words, why would it seem so fantastically heathen and blasphemous for the second degree, so to speak, in Holy Orders to employ such an oath? They cannot answer, without being false to their own ritual, that it is because the order of priesthood is of greater honour than Freemasonry, for when the candidate is invested with his apron he is told that it is more honourable *than any other order in existence.*

Dr Arundell Esdaile, late secretary of the British Museum and a devout churchwarden, in a letter to the local press (*East Grinstead Observer*, 2 March 1951) stated publicly his reasons for leaving the Craft. Some words of his sum up what many Christians must feel over these oaths. "I had an ingrained feeling that words, especially when solemnly uttered with one hand resting on the open Bible, should say what they mean and mean what they say."

I am taken to task for my interpretation of light and darkness in the ritual. Of course the darkness from which the candidate emerges is relative and not absolute; belief in God certainly implies a degree of previous light. But the symbolism of the ritual and catechisms is clear. The hoodwink, such references as "a poor candidate in a state of darkness", "the popular and uninstructed world who are not Freemasons", and the indication of the symbolical lights of Masonry which follow the restoration to material light—all these things surely imply that Masonry imparts light, a Masonic light which, unlike Christ the Light of the World, is hidden under the bushel of a close-tyled lodge. This dualism of light and darkness, however relative the darkness or imperfect the light, was a marked characteristic of gnostic thought.

I am quite well aware of the distinction between Regular, Grand Orient, and Theosophical Masonry. If I "do not know enough of my subject to distinguish between orthodox, heterodox, and 'tentative' authors" within Regular Masonry I can only ask, who does? For there is no Grand Lodge *imprimatur* or *nihil obstat*, and some of the most truly shocking sentiments appear in a series of books by J. S. M. Ward to which Sir John Cockburn, Past Grand Deacon (of England) and Past Deputy Grand Master (of Australia) wrote introductions. His "gaggle of letters" is at least as impressive as Mr Dart's. It would indeed be easier for a Christian priest to defend the Craft were it possible to produce any official condemnation of such grossly heretical writings, but unfortunately there is no Grand Lodge ruling on what is orthodox and what is heterodox or tentative. Again I forbear the temptation to quote from such books, for my contention is that the ritual itself is incapable of an orthodox interpretation.

The real crux of the matter is Mr Dart's seeming admission that Christians are justified in joining in the worship of a lowest-common-denominator God, shorn of all attributes peculiar to any particular religion, in which sincere believers of any faith can agree. (I pass over the fact that his Sacred Name in the Royal Arch workings links the name of Jahweh with that of Baal and On, and that he is given the distinctive attributes of the Hindu trinity, facts which would have scandalized the Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and Haggai of the Old Testament, but not apparently the Royal Arch office-bearers who assume these names to-day.) The Great Architect of the Universe, says Mr Dart, means to the Christian the Blessed Trinity, while others believe him to be Allah or Shiva. "Is it wrong", he asks, "to pray with them?"

This question is of vital importance, and the Pope is surely not

alone in giving an affirmative answer. The Church of England has never sanctioned joint worship between Christians and Hindus; a great number of Anglicans have strong objections to joint services with the Nonconformists, though the differences here are far less significant. The Church is the body of Christ, a worshipping body seeking salvation in no other name than that of Christ. The Church is also a body of worshippers, made up (on earth) of individuals redeemed in Christ. Are they then justified as Christian individuals in laying aside outside the Church the fullness of the Christian faith to worship a common-denominator non-Christian God? Is there for Christians one worship of the Church, another of the Masonic Temple? Is the assertion that in their hearts they believe this Masonic conception of God to be the Holy Trinity, and that in their hearts they worship him as such, a sufficient pretext for this apparent act of apostasy? "We have found the worship of God, O citizen of the world," is a motto of the Royal Arch. The obvious inference is that this worship is found in Masonry, where the Son of God is excluded in order that people who reject him may be included.

The admitted adoption of pagan usages and myths in the Masonic ritual cannot be altogether justified by Mr Dart's argument that they contain much of moral value and are unobjectionable in themselves. Of course Christianity had its pagan antetypes and foreshadowings, and for those who know not Christ these things may be lawful as representing the highest idea of God, of worship or moral precept, of which they are aware. Christianity has indeed adopted and sanctified many such usages, for Christ came not to destroy but to fulfil. But for Christians to drop the name of Christ from their forms of worship and to revert to pagan forms in quest of spiritual light is a very different and more dangerous matter; it dishonours the Incarnation, God's supreme and final revelation of truth, by ignoring it and by going behind Christ's back.

What a pity that so many Christian martyrs in pagan Rome needlessly lost their lives through refusing to cast a few grains of incense to paganism, when our Christian Masons to-day could so easily have justified this abhorrent practice to them—must we wait, they would have said, until all these pagan Romans have accepted God's manifestation of himself in the Incarnation before we can join with them in prayer?

Mr Dart refers to the higher degrees of Masonry which, he asserts, are completely Christian and orthodox, and accuses me of shying away from them. The initials which he gives after his name indicate not only his high rank in Craft Masonry, but also that he is a Knight Templar and a Past Most Wise Sovereign of the Rose Croix de Heredom. He must be aware, therefore, that these degrees, like Grand Orient and Theosophical Masonry, are not part of "Regular Masonry". They are not controlled or officially recognized by Grand Lodge, which claims the Royal Arch to be the supreme height of the "Regular" Masonic system. Nor are their rituals completely orthodox.

The following passage, for instance, comes in the opening of a Rose Croix chapter: "Then it is the hour in which the Veil of the Temple was rent in twain, when darkness overspread the earth, when the true light departed from us, when the Altar was thrown down, when the Blazing Star was eclipsed, when the Cubic Stone poured forth Blood and Water, when the Word was lost, and when despair and tribulation sat heavy on us. Since Masonry has experienced such dire calamities, it is our duty, Very Excellent and Perfect Princes, to endeavour, by renewed labours, to retrieve our loss; . . ."

What dire calamities did Masonry experience at the Crucifixion, and how can the labours of the Very Excellent and Perfect Princes of the Rose Croix de Heredom retrieve any "loss" brought about by the Son of God on the Cross? Did this degree, by any chance, originally mourn, not the death of our Lord, but the defeat of Satan?

Craft Masons may in all good faith undergo the ceremony of the death and raising of Hiram Abiff without any suspicion that they may possibly be partaking in a pagan solar myth or representing Zoroaster, just as the women seen by Ezekiel in a vision weeping for Tammuz in the Temple may not have realized that they were acting improperly. Perhaps they could have symbolized their tears into quite orthodox channels. Yet it is difficult to understand how a communicant Christian can partake of the "feast of fraternal affection" in the Rose Croix workings without feeling that here may be something more than a mere *agape*. The *pax vobiscum* exchanged between the partaking of the wafer and the wine is reminiscent of a familiar ceremony, and the words *consummatum est* appear to be a direct reference to Calvary. Admittedly this degree is now overlarded with Christian phraseology, but the eighteenth century in which it had its obscure origin was a heyday of underground satanism and of the occult. Does not the word *Abaddon*, used in the immediately preceding degree, reek of sulphur?

Two vital questions remain unanswered in this controversy. Is it in accordance with the moral law that a man should bind himself in advance by oath to secrecy and obedience in a matter of faith and morals concerning the very nature of which he has no previous knowledge? And, secondly, is there a valid motive for such secrecy? Why should any teaching on faith, morals, and the nature of God, be secret and inculcated only in a close-tyled Lodge, when the Gospel of Christ is universal and free? If the Church has Christ's sole authority on earth to teach faith and morals, then the Church has not only the right but indeed the duty to investigate the teachings of any other body which claims religious knowledge, and pronounce whether or not this knowledge is compatible with the teachings of Christ.

I cannot forbear pointing out in conclusion that Mr Dart is singularly unfortunate in the choice of two of those three prominent Masons whom he holds up from the past for our example. There is no conclusive evidence that Sir Christopher Wren was ever initiated at all. But "was Frederick the Great a playboy?" Only, it seems, inside the Lodge. He was quite content to use Masonry for political

ends, but referred to it contemptuously after his initiation as "child's play and *ignis fatuus*". So mote it be.

Yours faithfully,
WALTON HANNAH.

THE ASSUMPTION OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

It is good to have the difficulties felt by non-Roman Catholics about the doctrine of the Assumption of our Lady set forth so ably by Professor H. E. W. Turner in his University sermon preached at Oxford on 17 November 1950 and printed in your February number. I feel, however, that it should have been made clearer that those difficulties strike their roots down to a deeper level than the sermon indicated.

The radical difference between Roman Catholics and Anglicans or Free Churchmen is to be found in what we hold respectively concerning the nature of revealed truth, of the act of faith by which it is accepted, and of the authority that mediates it to mankind. No doctrine is held *de fide* by the Roman Catholic Church because the historical evidence for it is sufficient; all doctrine is held *de fide* solely because God has revealed it, whether the historical evidence is sufficient or not. He reveals it by his Word spoken through the Church, which interprets and complements his Word written in Scripture. Scriptural evidence treated historically, like other historical evidence, renders faith a reasonable act and the object of faith credible, where it involves a verifiable event. In no case, however, can such evidence cause faith, or be its necessary basis, though it may dispose to faith and be its human starting-point. St Thomas, after our Lord's first appearance to the assembled disciples, had ample historical evidence of the Resurrection, which could render his act of faith, had he been able to make it, entirely reasonable; yet he did not believe.

The Anglican position as described by Professor Turner does seem to make historical evidence the cause of faith or its necessary basis. "We believe", he writes, "in the Virgin Birth of our Lord, in his positive sinlessness and his Resurrection and Ascension, because of New Testament evidence which we hold to be sufficient."

Does the Anglican position maintain that every *de fide* doctrine must have historical evidence as its basis or cause? If so, how can belief in the doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, which, as God's Word, is for Anglicans the ultimate source of revelation, be said to have such evidence as its cause or basis? If not, whatever else may do so, the lack of historical evidence for the Assumption of our Lady should present no difficulties to Anglicans.

Yours truly,
HENRY ST JOHN, O.P.

BLACKFRIARS SCHOOL,
LLANARTH, RAGLAN, MON.
14 *February* 1951.

Professor Turner writes:

I am indeed aware that the roots of the divergence between Anglicans and Roman Catholics on the question of the definition of the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary cut deeper than a consideration of the evidence adduced for or against its truth. But a sermon is not a book, and apart from pointing out that "the definition of the dogma of the Assumption looks very different from outside the Roman Catholic Church than it must do from within", I addressed myself to one particular aspect of the matter.

Anglicans believe in Revelation and in the necessity for faith no less strongly than a Roman Catholic, but they prefer to phrase their doctrine in a different way. Revelation comes to us not as a thing in itself, but mediated through the historical process. Faith, therefore, involves the element of discovery and of discernment no less than acceptance or committal. The example of St Thomas adduced by Fr St John would support this view of faith better than his own. St Thomas does not believe the revelation apart from the experience of personal discovery.

The statement that "no doctrine is held *de fide* by the Roman Catholic Church because the historical evidence for it is sufficient; all doctrine is held *de fide* solely because God has revealed it, whether the historical evidence is sufficient or not" raises acute difficulties for an Anglican. Not only does it seem to leave open the possibility, as Fr St John phrases the point, that God might reveal something for which the historical evidence was insufficient, but it involves what for an Anglican appears a *husteron proteron*. We accept a doctrine as authoritative because it appears to be true; we do not believe it to be true simply because it comes to us on authority. Historical evidence we certainly regard as the basis of faith in doctrines which depend mainly on historical facts. I have nothing to alter in my statement on the Virgin Birth or the other articles of faith which I mentioned in the passage from my original sermon which he quotes. Either the historical evidence for them is sufficient or they are untrue. I do not see that this materially differs from his own statement that "Scriptural evidence, treated historically, like other historical evidence, renders faith a reasonable act and the object of faith credible". If in the case of a verifiable event such evidence makes the object of faith credible, how can it fail in this very event to be the necessary basis?

Fr St John asks me whether the Anglican position maintains that every *de fide* doctrine must have historical evidence as its basis or cause. I should agree with the proviso that the exact character of our appeal to history would differ with the subject matter of various doctrines. The Virgin Birth, for example, either did or did not happen, and faith in this part of the Christian truth will depend directly upon historical evidence. It cannot be said with regard to the doctrine of the Trinity that it either did or did not happen in precisely the same way. We accept this doctrine as *de fide* because it appears a necessary implication of the data historically contained within the Bible and particularly within the New Testament. Be-

lief in the doctrine of the inspiration of Holy Scripture can be defended from this point of view. It contains a pattern of fact and interpretation covering an impressive amount of human history with sufficient unity of theme and width of treatment to make the doctrine of its inspiration a necessary inference from what is contained within it. This approach to Biblical inspiration does not differ except in subject matter from the procedure adopted towards the Roman Catholic inquirer with regard to the evidence for Petrine claims and the theory of authority based by Roman Catholics upon them.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE VENTURE OF PRAYER. By Hubert Northcott, C.R., with Preface by the Bishop of Ely. S.P.C.K. 14s. 6d.

A treatise on prayer is bound to be also, in some measure, a treatise on Christian faith and practice; and the first obvious merit of this admirable book is that it puts the whole activity of prayer in its full and proper context. For the praying individual is not a free-lance, but one who stands in a divinely given Covenant-relationship with God, and for whom the Church is his home.

So Fr Northcott wisely gives considerable space and emphasis to fundamentals; of the eight chapters which form the first part of the book, the opening three are concerned with God himself, the Church, and its worship; and this familiar material he illuminates with the freshness of original insight—e.g. the brief exposition of the way in which the truth of the Blessed Trinity meets human needs (pp. 38 ff.), and the description and evaluation of liturgical worship (pp. 54 ff.). The reader (if at all like this reader) will find himself saying again and again, "Yes, that is exactly right; that expresses perfectly what I have been feeling after."

The other five chapters of Part I are entitled "Mental Prayer"; "Complications"; "The Christian Ascesis"; "Psychology and the Saints"; and "Intercession". Of mental prayer the writer remarks, "There will be no unnatural straining after the unattainable, but a turning to our Father. God is our home, and home is the one place where we can be just ourselves . . . and where we have no fear of being misunderstood." The whole chapter is masterly. The "Complications" are the obstacles set in the Christian's way by the world, the flesh, and the devil; and "the Christian Ascesis" is the training which we need for our conflict against these enemies. The most novel chapter in this section is "Psychology and the Saints"; it includes an acute critique of the benefits and the limitations of recent psychological teaching. In treating of intercession, Fr Northcott rightly finds the secret of it in the great Dominical utterance "For their sakes I consecrate myself . . ." Less central to his theme, but still worth remembering, is this sentence: "When our Lord tells St Peter that He has prayed for him that his faith fail not, he does not give the impression that he had said a psalm or a versicle with that

intention." (Not that the author in any way undervalues the method of "special intentions".)

The second part of the book introduces us to the deeper things of prayer; it is concerned with Contemplation: how it is approached, what it is, what are its effects. Special subjects—the Will of God; the Dark Night; Reparation—are given a chapter each. There is much in this second part which will be beyond the present experience of most readers, but there is nothing which they will not find it profitable to read. For the heights attained by the contemplatives belong to the same terrain as our own humbler paths, and God has called them thither not merely for some private privilege of their own, but for the general benefit of their fellow-members in the Body of Christ. What Fr Northcott has to tell us on these great themes is backed not only by his familiarity with the classical exponents of mysticism, but also by his own experience as pilgrim and as guide, by his conviction of the continuity of contemplative or mystical prayer with the more familiar ways of praying, and by what we have already learned of his skill and trustworthiness in Part I of the present work.

The book is not faultless; and here are some minor criticisms. In two places something has gone wrong with the numbering: on pp. 70 ff. the "three" ways which we are promised become four; and in Chapter XIII, "Some Counsels", the first number given to any counsel is 2. The "incomprehensible" (*immensus*) of the Athanasian Creed is misinterpreted (p. 245); so is St Paul's "none of us liveth to himself" (p. 267)—the relationship of which the Apostle speaks being between oneself and the Lord, not between oneself and one's fellow men; there is an inaccurate citation from St Luke (p. 280); the plural "dice" is given a singular verb (p. 239); and the barbarism "different than" makes an unwelcome appearance (p. 158).

Two other criticisms are more important, but also more tentative. First, it might have been better, in a book for the ordinary Christian, if Part I had been somewhat expanded, and Part II correspondingly shortened. And, secondly, there might have been more stress on the truth that all genuine prayer, at whatever level, is fundamentally and primarily the work of the Holy Spirit; a divine activity in which we are caught up.

But it is a grand book, and it should win a large circle of grateful readers. ✠Eric Brechin:

The Old Testament against its Environment. By G. Ernest Wright. S.C.M. Press. 6s.

This is a most valuable and stimulating book. It should be read by all students at universities and training colleges who are being reared on the still current textbooks of Hebrew religion—the best-known of which is here firmly put in its place by a devastating footnote. On the negative side, Professor Wright is concerned to expose the fallacy of "progressive revelation", as the view that Israel's faith

advanced chronologically from the "isms" of Comparative Religion to the ethical, spiritualized monotheism of, let us say, Deutero-Isaiah. He points to the obvious but strangely neglected fact that the Hebrews, even at the epoch of Abraham, were not "primitive" whatever meaning is given to that term. On the contrary, they were moving in an environment which was highly civilized and sophisticated, in religion as in other things. Further, Israelite history is not patient of neat systematizing. There were, at all periods, different strata of thought and widely diverse outlooks, existing side by side and reacting against and upon one another.

Professor Wright brings out these considerations extremely well. On the positive side, he claims that from the first there were elements in Israelite religion which differentiated it sharply from the cults of the surrounding nations, in spite of many superficial resemblances to which, Professor Wright believes, some Biblical scholars pay too much attention. Or perhaps not quite from the first; for Professor Wright appears to date the religion of Israel, which "suddenly appears in history", from the work of Moses. This is certainly a step backward from the standpoint common in the last century, when the distinctive elements in Israelite religion were thought to originate with the great prophets; but it still appears to imply that the patriarchal narratives are fundamentally a post-Mosaic construction, a view which finds less and less favour at the present day. Professor Wright finds the "otherness" of the Old Testament revelation to be constituted by three factors: the worship of one sole Yahweh; the nation's election by, and covenant-relationship with, him; and the absence of magical practices and of the "myth-ritual pattern" from the Israelite cultus. It will be obvious how many debatable questions are raised by this list, but Professor Wright is aware of them, and always presents his own point of view with great wisdom and persuasiveness.

On two matters, however, his treatment leaves something to be desired. Following Professor Henri Frankfort, he writes that "the God of Israel has no mythology". It would be truer to say "no *polytheistic* mythology", for there is surely a very free and creative use of myth in the Old Testament, as Professor Wright himself seems to recognize when he writes on another page that the Israelites essentially expressed themselves "by means of picture, story, and metaphor". Again, Professor Wright's discussion of Israelite monotheism is disappointing. The unity of God is not affected by the idea of a heavenly Council of Yahweh, any more than it is by the Jewish and Christian belief in angels. But the question is raised when we review the Old Testament hypostatizations, such as Wisdom or Word, which Professor Wright does not mention at all, and it is really with these that the Christological formulations of the New Testament should be compared.

J. R. Porter.

Oriel College,
Oxford.

Oxford and the Evangelical Succession. By Marcus L. Loane. Lutterworth Press. 15s.

The author, who is the Vice-Principal of Moore Theological College, Australia, has obviously enjoyed writing this book, and communicates his enthusiasm to the reader. It is an excellent introduction to the lives of five of the leaders of the Evangelical Movement in the Anglican Church, and is a book which ought to be in every parish library. The writer traces their inner history and shows the particular contribution they made to the life of the Evangelical Movement and to the Church.

We were glad to have an account of Richard Cecil, who ministered at St John's, Bedford Row, for nearly thirty years and who had a great influence on his contemporaries, especially some of the members of the Clapham Sect; and of Daniel Wilson, one of the outstanding missionary statesmen of the past century.

We cannot understand why the book should have been called *Oxford and the Evangelical Succesison*, for, despite the author's preface, there is no justification at all for its title. It would have been better to have called it simply "The Evangelical Succession", for John Newton and Thomas Scott had no connexion at all with the university. It would be just as absurd to include a biographical sketch of Thomas Jones of Creaton in a volume on "Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession", because Jones was a friend of Thomas Robinson and Henry Venn and because Simeon influenced him to accept the curacy of Creaton! Cambridge has been regarded as the nursery of the Evangelicals, and the title of this volume suggested that at last there was a book which would adjust the balance, but we were disappointed. Why, too, does the author begin with Whitefield? No one would wish to minimize his influence, but it could be argued effectively that his actions precipitated the events which led to the secession of the Methodists from the Anglican Church. If the writer had wished to deal with Oxford it would have been much more impressive if his first biographical sketch had been devoted to Romaine, who for many years was the sole Evangelical rector of a London parish and whose writings had a profound influence on his contemporaries. The choice of Newton and Scott might suggest that there were few outstanding Oxford men who were associated with the movement. The author could have dealt with Isaac Crouch, who for years was Vice-Principal of St Edmund Hall; or with Walker of Truro, whose services were regarded as a model of Anglican worship; or James Hervey, Thomas Haweis, Biddulph of Bristol, Basil Woodd, Dr Marsh, Howell Harris, all men who had a formative influence on the life of the Church.

Canon Loane rightly emphasizes that these early Evangelicals were all "strong Churchmen". This fact, however, could have been more strongly presented. He could have shown that they were the pioneers who were responsible for the revival of the service of Holy Communion in the life of the Church, and that they were deeply concerned about the conduct of worship. In his chapter on Newton he might have substantiated this point by making much better use

of Newton's *Apologia; or Four letters to a Minister of an Independent Church*, where the first letter is a forthright and telling defence of liturgical worship. There is no mention that during Scott's London ministry he celebrated the Holy Communion every Sunday, and Cecil, in his *Remains*, has some judicious remarks about worship worthy of quotation. The bibliography of Daniel Wilson is inadequate and no reference is made to his *A Plain Affectionate Address to Young Persons previous to their receiving the Lord's Supper*, which by 1845 had run into thirteen editions. And use might have been made of his Wynberg sermon, one of the finest in our language on worship. There are occasions when understatement would have been more effective; he says, for instance, that Whitefield was the leading figure of the Welsh revival. The leading figure was Harris, but the real pioneer who influenced Harris, Rowlands, and Howell Davies, was Griffith Jones. John Evans, vicar of Eglwys Gymun, a neighbour of Jones, said, "All three came out of Mr Jones's shop with their heads turned exactly the same way"!

The book shows little signs of original research and suffers, too, from a certain amount of repetition, and it is not entirely free from mistakes—e.g. on page 128 Romaine's death is given correctly as 1795, on page 166 as 1796. On page 180 read sixty-one for fifty-three; on page 189 the date January 2nd, 1801, should be 1821.

WIGAN. GWYN ROGERS.

THE SCIENCE OF HUMANITY. By K. G. Collier. Nelson. 12s. 6d.

Although it is undoubtedly a worthy ambition to emulate the omni-competence of the classical and medieval scholars, in these days of increasing specialization it becomes more and more difficult for any one person to master the fundamentals of a large number of subjects and present the results intelligibly. Mr Collier may be thought to be attempting the impossible in trying to assemble material on questions as far apart as the anatomy of the brain or the biological laws of heredity, on the one hand, and the economic theory of the trade cycle or the culture of the Mundugumor on the other. Yet the attempt is a gallant one, and the need in the human sciences for a synoptic viewpoint and a measure of co-ordination is so great that Mr Collier cannot be given anything but praise. He does not claim that he is making any new and original contribution to knowledge, but rather that his book is meant for adults or mature students who want to know what science has to say on the human situation. Nevertheless, even the specialist would benefit from the new perspective which Mr Collier brings to social studies, and the way in which he relates the latest findings in a number of different fields to each other and to the main theme running throughout the book—the economic, cultural, and religious crisis of our times.

A question which students of human behaviour are constantly asking themselves is the extent to which scientific method can be properly applied to man and society. Mr Collier's is an excellent discussion of this very difficult point. He draws attention to the

place of statistics and the laws of probability as the basis of scientific method applied to human affairs, whether in relation to Mendel's hypothesis regarding the process of heredity, studies of public opinion, intelligence test scores, or a number of other scientific problems of human behaviour. Mr Collier does not overlook the importance also of case study material such as that used by the clinical psychologist and the anthropologist.

As a Christian, Mr Collier has some interesting things to say about the influence of science upon values; he points out that a system built up purely on the basis of a rational interpretation of the nature of man, as viewed by science, would have the status only of recommendations, when the crying need of our civilization is for a value system which will have the force of obligation in the human personality. Only a belief in a benevolent God such as that provided by Christianity can create the sense of moral obligation which makes values absolute and not relative or merely pragmatic. Anthropological research shows wide divergences in the values implicit in any culture, but Mr Collier refers to the evidence yielded by comparative studies that there is much in common between the moral codes of leading sages and religious teachers of many civilizations. He is courageous in facing the problem of introjected value systems which may be of a compulsive or pathological origin, although in the last resort he leaves unsolved the issue of how a pathological value system is distinguished from any other.

There are times when Mr Collier does not make it as clear as he should do when he is quoting the research and conclusions of a recognized authority and when he is expressing his own personal opinions and interpretations. His last section, "studying a community in action", is disappointing in its brevity and its failure to draw attention to the various means of community study and action research now being developed in social science. Nevertheless *The Science of Humanity* is a book that deserves to be widely read by a thoughtful public.

A. H. Richmond.

University of Liverpool.

St Francis in Italian Painting. By George Kaftal. George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This is an early volume in an elaborate new series which sets itself a formidable aim. "The great religions", says the editors' introduction, "are not nearly so far from one another as they seem . . . The way of man's approach or return to God is in essence the same, in Christian and in non-Christian teaching", and this series (which now includes works on Rūmī, Li Po, and Sufism) "read and pondered with a desire to learn, will help men and women to find 'fulness of life' and peoples to live together in greater understanding and harmony". Hence "there will come a day, perhaps not a distant day . . . when men will be innocent and happy amid the beauty of the world".

From the Christian point of view this is more or less heresy, but in any case its sanguinity strikes a strange note at the ominous half-way of the twentieth century. Fortunately Dr Kaftal's book has no very obvious connexion with such delusive syncretism.

His title would lead one to hope for a systematic critical iconography of St Francis, whose legend became so completely transformed in the course of a couple of centuries that by 1452 Gozzoli's Montefalco frescoes have derived from some unclarified source wide accretions bearing no relation to history whatsoever, such as the saint's putative birth in a stable. By this time most of the conventional motifs of hagiography have overlaid the more authentic earlier legend: the inevitable corpse-raisings and storm-stillings, the cloak-to-beggar story, and such like. Instead of such an approach a cautious ultramontanism pervades the author's interesting compilation, and a personal opinion is nowhere ventured either about the legends or about art. The book corresponds closely, in fact, with his previous treatment of St Dominic and St Catherine of Siena. It consists of an anthology of passages from the standard sources of the Francis legend —Celano and Bonaventura and the *Fioretti*—with a well-chosen selection of reproductions, though mostly too small for clarity, of apposite paintings from the principal early cycles, chiefly Tuscan. These range from an early thirteenth-century altarpiece of Bonaventura Berlinghieri at Pescia, to Ghirlandaio's charming frescoe of 1486 in St Trinità, Florence, with its pleasant topographical details of the Spini Palace (which still stands) and the old bridge over the Arno—nothing of which incidentally has any factual place in the life of St Francis. The book makes it possible, but not obvious, to trace much of the changing shape of the developing Franciscan legend, so that few general readers are likely to pursue it. The introductory matter is in truth too slight and unco-ordinated to do justice to the theme. Nor does the text seem to have profited much from the promising bibliography given. There is no aesthetic discussion of the pictures as art and extremely little of the rôle of such painting in society and in the shaping of religious belief and practice. Nevertheless the work is sufficiently useful to make one wish the fifteen years of collecting material for it which Dr Kaftal mentions had issued in something more substantial and interpretative; a contribution to art-scholarship rather than an agreeable excursion into legend.

John H. L. Waterson.

Stoke D'Abernon.

Christian Love. By Paul E. Johnson. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $3.

In this interesting study Dr Johnson sets out to investigate the way in which Christian love ought to manifest itself in social and personal relations, and to inquire into the causes for its frequent failure in individual, family, national, and international life. He recognizes the limitations of the approach which he has chosen, and

states quite clearly that this is not a theological or a scientific treatise. "A psychology of Christian love", he says in his preface, ". . . stands in a vulnerable position . . . It will be too psychological for those who have a predominantly religious interest . . . It will not be psychological enough for those who have a predominantly scientific interest . . ." But if he bears in mind Dr Johnson's purpose in writing this book, the reader will find much in it that is helpful and challenging—and he will be grateful for its straightforward exposition and avoidance of "psychological jargon".

The Christian is fully aware of his duty to love, but it is good sometimes to be told clearly and simply what this means in practical terms. Dr Johnson contends that the failure of love is often to be attributed to imperfect training in this aspect of personal relation. Love has to be learnt by experiment in relation, and too frequently the family and society at large fail in their responsibility to the individual who needs and wants to grow in love. Several examples are given of the way in which children and the delinquent can be educated for love, and there are telling illustrations which will bring home to parents their special responsibilities and opportunities.

Naturally marriage and sexual relation are discussed, and Dr Johnson has a valuable section on the dangers of false romanticism and fatalism in love. He also has some pertinent things to say about marriage breakdown, and insists that "more attention should be given to the fact that love either grows or dies; there is no middle way". There is an important chapter on "Explosives in Social Conflicts", in which hate and the death instinct (Freud's *thanatos*) are considered, and in the last chapter Dr Johnson deals with the function of the Christian community in human society.

There are points at which the reader will probably want to join issue with the author—for instance, in connexion with the intensive Sunday-school curriculum which he quotes with approval as part of the child's education for love. Nor is it certain that we have in this country the resources for remedial work which seem to be available in U.S.A.; indeed, it would be helpful to have a similar study written against the British background of social life and education, though the reader will be moved to make any profitable comparisons.

Unfortunately there are minor blemishes in the shape of loose statements. Baptism is more than the "ceremony of giving a Christian name" and the presentation of the child "for divine approval and blessing"; Acton's dictum on power (which is incorrectly quoted) is not a proverbial saying; the doctrine of the Virgin Birth was not simply "thought necessary to uphold [Jesus'] sinlessness"—to mention a few of them. But these—and Dr Johnson's occasionally questionable exegesis of Scripture—do not essentially affect the value of a sincere and thought-provoking book in which the practical implications of Christian love are clearly and ably set forth.

Sherwin Bailey.

Edinburgh.

THE WINGS OF FAITH. By H. V. Martin. Lutterworth Press. 7s. 6d.

This is a small but good book. Its first chapter clears the ground admirably by a short résumé of non-Kierkegaardian views, such as the "wishful thinking" of Freud and Jung; the quasi-rationalistic approach of Aquinas and Hegel; the Schleiermachian theology of mystical experience; Kant's view of faith as the postulate of moral sense; "theological intuitionism" as Troeltsch and Otto develop it; theological dogmatism, and theological humanism. Thereafter Kierkegaard's own position is outlined under the captions of the problem, object, nature, and life of Christian faith.

To tidy up and compress into 100-odd pages so prolific and scintillating an author as Kierkegaard obviously presents many pitfalls. Some of those into which Dr Martin has fallen are worth mentioning, just because his sketch is, within its limits, a good one. Compression has led to phrases, strange to the uninitiated, popping up unexplained—e.g. "existential pathos" (p. 54), "passion of infinity" (p. 50). It is, too, an over-simplification to say that the basis of the "tragic cleft" within man is "guilt consciousness" (p. 55). The statement "to think existentially is to think in terms of human reality" is loose and imperfect: for Kierkegaard's "existing individual" is, above everything else, "before God". What does the phrase mean, "Christian revelation is not a communication about God, however true that may be"? The words "more than" should surely replace "not". Similarly, the side-heading, "the object of Christian faith is Jesus Christ himself and not his teaching" (p. 59), should have the word "only" or "primarily" after "not"; otherwise why does Kierkegaard spend pages expounding Christ's teaching, and setting him forth as pattern in word as well as life? And is there such a thing as a "non-paradoxical form of Christianity"? (p. 55). When Dr Martin says that "in thinking, the element of actual reality is absent" (p. 56), he is clearly speaking with unwarrantable looseness.

Such blemishes detract from the value of an otherwise valuable little study; and there are many like blemishes. I could wish, too, that more had been made of the faculty of Wonder. The word does not appear in the index, which is alarmingly sketchy. If Dr Martin knew Danish, he would, I think, have chosen the word "instant" on pp. 78, 96, and 129, instead of "moment". (I have explained why in my *Kierkegaard Studies*, p. 28.) Dr Martin rightly tells us how Kierkegaard came to admire monasticism. The reader ought to know that he has much criticism also.

It is good that Dr Martin finds place to mention the incarnations in Hinduism. The question, Why leap to Christianity rather than to any other form of religion? has to be answered. And Dr Martin's answers to Bain, Macintosh, and Allen, are all good. Luther is mentioned more sympathetically by Dr Martin than, on the whole, by Kierkegaard. The question of faith and works is dealt with, though the book *Works of Love*, so necessary here, is not even mentioned. It is astonishing that the first avowedly full Christian exposition by the Lutheran Kierkegaard in his own name, is this volume of more than 3,000 Danish pages, not on faith but works.

This is the answer (not altogether satisfactory to those who preach the social implications of Christianity) to those who say Kierkegaard had no social sense. I am glad, too, that Dr Martin mentions Predestination. There is more about it, and about Calvin, in the *Papirer* (untranslated), more than those without Danish suspect.

As for Kierkegaard and the Church, Dr Martin quotes Martensen with effect, though hardly enthusiasm. Yet Martensen and Brunner are right in saying that Kierkegaard does not give the Church a fair deal in his writings. He did in his practice, until near the end, and the *Papirer* show awareness of the importance of the Church. It is, however, better to study what Kierkegaard did say, than to blame him for what he did not.

We must beware, I think, of making Kierkegaard into the kind of belittler of the reason that modern nonsensical pseudo-existentialists sometimes are. So keen a dialectition as Kierkegaard must needs use reason to the full. But reason always reaches a limit beyond which it cannot go. The absolute paradox, which lies beyond, is not silly but sublime. Leap to it, but do not deprecate reason so far as it can go. Perhaps Dr Martin could have kept the balance a little steadier.

I congratulate him for not mentioning the broken engagement till p. 119, and then only once. I wish there were an agreed form of abbreviation for Kierkegaard's works; Dr Martin has perforce made his own. Once again I commend the book. It gives a short insight into the background of a great author.

T. H. Croxall.

Copenhagen.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Glorious Assumption of the Mother of God. By Joseph Duhr, S.J. Translated by J. M. Fraunces, S.J. Burns Oates. 8s. 6d.

Written with the papal definition in prospect, this book sets forth a Roman Catholic case for the Assumption which is semi-official. It discusses the evolution of the doctrine, its definability, and present opportuneness. The publishers claim that it is the only work of its kind in English, but it would be more accurate to say that it is the only work of its kind in English in support of the dogma.

Fr Duhr belittles the importance of the circumstantial narratives which form the earliest evidence of the Assumption, and finds in the divine motherhood of Mary the ruling theological influence. It is, however, a little saddening to see so much erudition combined with so much partiality. As he unfolds his evidence, the author is in full prepossession of his conclusions, and shows something akin to impatience when the evidence lags behind. For example, the non-Roman reader must feel an intruder when, writing of the silence of the first five centuries, the author injudiciously exclaims: "The darkness, however, is not complete. Two glimmerings in this night give

hope for a dawn." The minimum of emphasis is given to the apocryphal stories, to Ado, Usuard, the pseudo-Jerome, and they appear to be brought into the argument merely to be brushed aside. A paucity of dates detracts from the lucidity and cogency of the historical section.

In a brief chapter on the nature of dogma Fr Duhr appears to recognize that the recent definition raises questions beyond the doctrine of the Assumption itself. Among Roman Catholic theologians revolutionary ideas concerning Tradition are now being entertained and fostered. To Fr Duhr it seems "natural" and "conformed to the facts" to admit in the development of doctrine a progress from the virtually implicit to the formally explicit. This technical but fateful formula, although at the moment representing only a theory, seems to be forced upon Roman Catholic theologians by the dogmas with which they now have to deal, and in addition to its being in itself an innovation, oversetting Tradition as it was understood at Trent and at the Vatican, gives a long lease to the development of further doctrines which may be indistinguishable from novelties.

So little has been written in this country concerning the Assumption that this book is to be welcomed. Yet it does little to allay the disquiet expressed by Roman Catholics and others in Europe and in this country. VICTOR BENNETT.

OF THE CHRISTIAN ALTAR AND THE BUILDINGS WHICH CONTAIN IT. By J. Ninian Comper. With a Preface by the Bishop of London. S.P.C.K. 5s.

All who are concerned with the planning or furnishing of churches should read Sir Ninian Comper's small monograph. In it the most distinguished of contemporary church architects and ecclesiologists reiterates some of the points on the arrangement of churches, which all his life he has been teaching the Church of England. To Sir Ninian a church must express in visible terms the beauty of the eternal world; and here he reminds us of certain practical details which help to make of a church a thing of beauty.

An altar, he tells us, looks best if it stands detached on all four sides, is covered with a ciborium, and is not overloaded with ornaments. We must not put flowers on it; two lights are sufficient, and if we want more standard candlesticks should be arranged round or in front of the altar. A hanging pyx, or what Sir Ninian prefers to call a suspended tabernacle, is the best method of reserving the Sacrament. We should also pay attention to the west end, often the most neglected part of an Anglican church. Sir Ninian thinks a west end is best brightened up with a tall painted font cover of a late medieval type. There are of course other ways, particularly an imaginative use in new churches of a narthex or ante-chapel. We should, too, stop cluttering up our naves with chairs or seats which are never wanted; and his pungent remarks on Diocesan Advisory Committees and the danger that they may drive away the muses ought not go unheeded.

Spain has cast its spell on Sir Ninian. His points are constantly illustrated by reference to Spanish churches; and to him Seville Cathedral is the most beautiful in the world. He is not unique amongst Anglicans in this. The two greatest ecclesiologists of the nineteenth century, one of whom was also a great architect—namely, Dr J. M. Neale and G. E. Street—were both fascinated by Spanish churches. Men of letters, too, fall under their spell; and Mr Sacheverell Sitwell has recently confessed to laying awake at night, his mind full of visions of Spanish cathedrals and churches, those which he had seen already and those which he still hoped to see. Ecclesiologists who, like Sir Ninian and his two great predecessors, dream of churches which make a magnificent and splendid setting for the worship of the King of Kings, certainly in Spain find their dream come true.

Anglicans are always searching for a church which in plan makes for congregational worship, so difficult in the long narrow buildings bequeathed to us by the middle ages. In Spain, as Sir Ninian has so often pointed out, the churches are planned in a way that would suit Anglican needs. They are wide in proportion to their length; the *coro* or seating for the clergy is frequently in the western half of the nave, thus allowing the laity to flood the very centre of the scene of worship. All his life Sir Ninian has been telling us that we must plan our churches so as to bring the lay-folk near the altar; but how slow we are in taking his advice.

York. G. W. O. Addleshaw.

The Religious Thought of St John. By E. K. Lee. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

This is a very sound and competent, if not very original, piece of work. The author is vicar of a large parish, and cannot have found it easy to carry out the careful course of study that evidently lies behind this book. He gives a reasonably full bibliography (though one or two important items are missing, particularly Bultmann's *Commentary*), and it is clear that he is familiar with the contents as well as the titles of the books he lists. Indeed, he sometimes gives the impression of having too great a respect for "authorities", and in the critical parts of his work the clarity of his argument is occasionally sacrificed to his anxiety to do justice to the many conflicting views which have the authority of great names behind them. In places also he tends to encumber his pages with bare strings of references which can be of little use to the persons most likely to profit from his work (see, for example, p. 47).

These are, however, minor blemishes in comparison with the solid merits of the book. The author is at his best as an expositor—and here doubtless his experience as a parish priest has given him some compensating advantages. He has a sympathetic insight into the theology of St John, and a keen sense of the richness and complexity, and at the same time fundamental unity, of his thought, and his readers will gratefully acknowledge that he has in a large

measure achieved the purpose which he states as follows (pp. 258 f.):

"In the early Church two aspects of the Christian message may be discerned. There was the declaration of what God had done through Jesus Christ, and there was the preaching of what kind of behaviour was required of those who accepted Christ. The *kerygma* and *didache* were two parts of one whole. . . .

"In the Johannine writings these two parts of the Christian message are completely integrated. It is this comprehensive unity of the teaching of John that we have endeavoured to display throughout this book. The different parts of his message all dovetail into one another and are dependent upon one another to such a degree that they cannot be understood in isolation. The great unifying idea is that God is love. The whole of John's theology and ethics are based upon this fact which he learned through the ministry, death, and resurrection, of Jesus Christ. It is this that gathers all the varied details of Johannine thought into one whole."

PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE. J. N. SANDERS.

WILLIAM CUNNINGHAM, TEACHER AND PRIEST. By Audrey Cunningham. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

More than thirty-one years have passed since Archdeacon Cunningham died, and few of his personal friends and pupils are left in Cambridge, but those who knew him will be grateful to his daughter for this intimate and ably written memoir of an eminent historian, teacher, and priest, and her book deserves to be widely read. Most of Cunningham's life was spent in Cambridge, and as Mr F. R. Salter notes in his admirable preface, he was associated with such "intellectual giants" as Henry Sidgwick, Maitland, McTaggart, Westlake, Marshall, Seeley, Creighton, G. W. Prothero, and, for some years, Lord Acton; and he was worthy to be ranked with them. F. D. Maurice died while he was an undergraduate, but his influence was still powerful, and this memoir shows how much Cunningham owed to him in the development of his opinions on religion and ethics. Before he came to Cambridge his studies in Edinburgh had given him a strong bent towards philosophy, but the circumstances of his life, and his keen desire to serve his fellow men in the things of the spirit as well as the intellect, led him to change his course, and in 1873 he took Holy Orders. By his lectures in the university and by his books on the growth of English industry and commerce he laid a foundation for the academic study of economic history in Cambridge and elsewhere on which an imposing structure has been raised. Within the university he was an untiring advocate of reform, and though he often fought a losing battle many of the changes for which he contended have been carried out since his day. The bibliography at the end of this book reveals his astonishing industry and the wide range of his interests, and readers of this memoir may well wonder that his great ability was not recognized in Cambridge by promotion to a professorial chair. If there had been a professorship

of economic history in his lifetime, his claim to it would have been incontestable; but though he was thrice a candidate for a professorship in divinity he was not elected. He was not a specialist in any department of theological study, and boards of electors generally favour the specialist and are suspicious of versatility.

As Vicar of Great St Mary's and later Archdeacon of Ely, his pastoral gifts were conspicuously shown, and his learning and wisdom were of great value in Convocation; but from a worldly point of view Cunningham was not a successful man. He had to meet with many disappointments, but every reverse seemed to spur him to fresh effort. Miss Cunningham has given us a portrait of a man of striking intellectual power and of broad humanity; of one who was above all things a man of God.

CAMBRIDGE. G. A. WEEKES.

JEANNE JUGAN. By Francis Trochu. Burns Oates. 15s.

This is the story of Jeanne Jugan, otherwise Sister Marie of the Cross, the real founder of the Congregation of the "Little Sisters of the Poor". It should prove interesting to the general reader, though it is never exciting. The remarkable growth of the "Little Sisters" from the year 1839, when there were three, to 1879, when there were 2,400 sisters caring for 20,500 old people in five continents, is worthy of record.

The life of Jeanne Jugan is shrouded in a mystery, which this book really fails to explain satisfactorily. In the earlier chapters the reader continually meets such phrases as, "it might be", "perhaps", and "no doubt". The fact is that information about Jeanne is not very plentiful until the last fourteen years of a long life.

The strange story of the Abbé Le Pailleur, the self-styled "Founder and Superior-General", is related with restraint. It is at least possible that Jeanne herself chose freely the way of obscurity and abnegation attributed by her biographer to the machinations or self-delusion of the "Father-Founder". Perhaps we shall never know.

Certain interesting points emerge from the story. Jeanne moves in the modern world, she never sought publicity but she attained it. From the winning of the Montyon prize in 1843 until her last years, when a street was named after her, the public never forgot her. Jeanne, the "collector" with basket and umbrella, appealed to the public imagination. Louis Veuillot wrote of her in *l'Univers*; Charles Dickens probably met her.

Perhaps it was only after her enforced, or self-chosen retirement, at the age of 60, in 1852, that her sanctity began to be revealed. In the long years of silence and neglect that followed, her soul grew in grace. To the public she was always the foundress of the "Little Sisters"; but, strangely enough, it was not till the Abbé Leroy told the true story in 1902, that the Church came round to the same opinion. In 1935 the official seal on her sanctity was given when the Archbishop of Rennes approved a prayer for her beatification.

TUNBRIDGE WELLS. B. M. OMAN.

The Enquirer's Library. No. 1. What is Man for? (Joseph McCulloch). No. 2. Can a Scientist believe? (K. G. Collier). No. 3. Which Religion? (E. O. James). No. 4. Who was Jesus of Nazareth? (Stephen Neill). No. 5. Why organized Religion? (H. N. Hancock). No. 6. Talking about Sin (A. W. Eaton). No. 7. What is the Church? (Michael Stancliffe). No. 8. When you're dead, you're dead (Martin Jarrett-Kerr, C.R.). No. 9. Why Pain and Evil? (J. V. L. Casserley). No. 10. Good and bad Christians (Robert Petitpierre). No. 11. Can I believe the Bible? (J. D. Graham, C.R.). No. 12. How can I Pray? (Eric Hayman).

The Twenty Questions Series. No. 1. On Church Finance (Stanley Eley). No. 2. On Parish Organization (C. R. Forder). No. 3. On Church Music (G. H. Knight). No. 4. On Pageants in Church (C. E. Howell). No. 5. On Filmstrips (in School and Parish) (G. L. Wheeler). No. 6. On Parish Hall Entertainments (C. E. Howell). No. 7. On Sunday Schools (C. M. Knowles). No. 8. On Flowers in Church (I. Caudwell).

All Mowbrays, 24 pp. each, 6d.

The Enquirer's Library is a brave attempt at short expositions of Christian doctrine. Christians always find this a difficult job, for they have a special obligation to be intellectually honest, and a Christian pamphleteer has ticklish problems of compression where merely political writers can enjoy avoiding an awkward problem by pleading shortage of space. On the whole, these pamphlets do not avoid difficult points. They are, however, mainly suitable for thoughtful and for well-educated inquirers, who will not be put off by a few Latin phrases or by references to serious thinkers and writers of the past. The problems of writing in really simple language for very ordinary people is one which Christians have hardly begun to face.

It is natural that such a list of contributors should produce a set of pamphlets reflecting views on the Church, baptism and purgatory with which some Anglicans and most Nonconformists would strongly disagree (e.g. Nos. 7 and 10). Nobody would wish to emphasize the divisions between Christians in such pamphlets; yet it may be supposed that many "outsiders" will be puzzled by an almost total disregard of the Free Churches. The man in the street is by no means inclined to regard the Church of England as the one true Church, *inevitably* superior to the Methodists or Congregationalists or Baptists, whose buildings he passes at other street corners.

There is space for only a few detailed comments. Nos. 2 and 12 seem especially useful; No. 3 is, perhaps inevitably, a little difficult. Some may query one or two historical references in No. 4. But almost without exception all the series will stimulate interest and lead to further personal inquiries; and that is surely what such pamphlets are for.

The Twenty Questions Series is more limited in scope, and aims to give specific advice to parochial church councillors and other church workers. The question and answer form is a little inappro-

priate at times; but a set of booklets will provide much valuable and sensible advice. Nos. 4 and 6 are particularly good; No. 5 needs one or two illustrations; No. 7 is rather too scrappy and brief for so large a subject, and the style is a trifle too pedagogical. No. 8 completely overwhelms at least this poor reviewer with its admirable technical advice and information.

Both these series of pamphlets are excellently printed and produced; and both editors and publishers (who are also the printers) are to be congratulated on a most attractive format.

M. B. GIBBS.

AUDENSHAW.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: G. A. Buttrick, *So We Believe, So We Pray* ($2.75).

BLACKWELL: Leonard Hodgson, *Christian Faith and Practice* (8s. 6d.).

CANTERBURY PRESS: J. Marchant (Ed.), *The Coming-of-Age of Christianity* (12s. 6d.).

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND BOOK-ROOM (EDINBURGH): E. G. K. Hewat, *Christ and Western India* (8s.).

JONATHAN DAVID (NEW YORK): I. J. Gerber, *The Psychology of the Suffering Mind* ($3.50).

EPWORTH PRESS: H. Carter, *The Methodist Heritage* (15s.).

FABER AND FABER: Warner Allen, *The Uncurtained Throne* (12s. 6d.).

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: L. Maclachlan, *Fellowship Prayers* (1s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Cyril H. Powell, *Faith that Moves Mountains* (12s. 6d.).

LINCOLN RECORD SOCIETY: R. M. T. Hill, *The Rolls and Register of Bishop Oliver Sutton*, Vol. II (n.p.).

MOWBRAY: E. W. Southcott, *Receive this Child: Constructive Thinking on Baptism* (3s.); Lindsay Dewar (Ed.), *Training in Prayer* [New edition] (5s.); V. G. Shearburn, C.R., *At the Lord's Table* (2s. 6d.); A Religious of C.S.M.V., *The Little Book of the Contemplation of Christ* (4s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. J. McLachlan, *Socinianism in Seventeenth-Century England* (25s.); M. H. Shepherd, *The Oxford American Prayer Book Commentary* (50s.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: *People at Work* (2s. 6d.).

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY: Walter Lowrie, *Johann Georg Hamann* (75 cents).

ROCKCLIFF: Jean Guitton, *Essay on Human Love* (15s.); W. Tiverton, *D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence* (12s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: J. F. McLuskey, *Parachute Padre* (8s. 6d.).

SCAYNES HILL VICARAGE, HAYWARDS HEATH: H. S. Box, *Freemasonry and the Christian Faith* (1s. 1d., post free).

SECKER AND WARBURG: P. Blanshard, *Freedom and Catholic Power* (16s.).

S.P.C.K.: F. N. Davey, *The Word of Testimony* (Gore Memorial Lecture) (2s.).

THEOLOGIA (ATHENS): J. N. Karmaris, *The Schism of the Roman Church* (n.p.).

TYNDALE PRESS: Alan Cole, *The New Temple. A Study in the Origins of the Catechetical "Form" of the Church in the New Testament* (2s. 6d.); B. Burbridge, *The Way Back to God* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher